

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3 to 17 are pending in the present application. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,363,348 to Besling et al. ("Besling"). Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Besling and U.S. Patent No. 6,049,594 to Furman et al. ("Furman"). Claims 7 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Besling and U.S. Patent No. 6,0801,893 to Backfried et al. ("Backfried"). Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Furman and Besling.

Besling describes a method for recognizing an input pattern stored in a user station using a recognition unit of a server station. Column 1, lines 8 to 10. A vocabulary adaptation profile may include a list of additional words which are added to a basic vocabulary. Column 10, lines 54 to 58. Besling notes that "adding a new word to a vocabulary may, in itself, not be sufficient to ensure that the word can be recognized," that for a speech recognition system "a transcription in acoustic references is additionally required" and that for many languages "a reasonably accurate transcription can be achieved automatically for most words." Column 10, lines 58 to 63.

Independent claim 1 of the present application recites "speaking the vocabulary data to the voice recognition system in an automated manner using the audio module so as to expand the vocabulary database." Independent claim 16 recites that "speech data is spoken into the vocabulary database in an automated manner using the audio module so as to expand the vocabulary database." It is respectfully submitted that Besling does not teach or suggest speaking vocabulary/speech data into a vocabulary database in an automated manner using an audio module, as recited in claims 1 and 16. In contrast, Besling merely describes automatic transcription of a word into an acoustic

representation when adding the word to a vocabulary. See Besling column 10, line 58, to column 11, line 9. It is respectfully submitted that automatic transcription is not the same thing as, nor does automatic transcription teach or suggest, speaking vocabulary data to a voice recognition system in an automated manner using an audio module so as to expand a vocabulary database, as recited in claims 1 and 16.

The Office Action acknowledges, at page 2, that Backfried does not teach the feature of speaking vocabulary/speech data into a vocabulary database in an automated manner using an audio module, as recited in claims 1 and 16.

Furman is not relied on for teaching or suggest the feature of speaking vocabulary/speech data into a vocabulary database in an automated manner using an audio module, as recited in claims 1 and 16. Indeed, Furman does not teach or suggest at least this feature.

Because each of Besling, Backfried and Furman et al. fail to teach or suggest at least the above recited features of independent claims 1 and 16, it is respectfully submitted that Besling, Backfried, and Furman et al., whether taken alone or in combination, could not render claims 1 and 16, or their respective dependent claims, unpatentable.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the respective rejections of claims 1 and 3 to 17 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: February 11, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Erik R. Swanson
Erik R. Swanson

Registration No.: 40,833
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant